

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-3, 6-19, 22-39, 42-48, 51-56, 59-69, and 72 are pending and under consideration.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner acknowledged consideration of the documents submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed February 11, 2005 and resubmitted June 19, 2006. A copy of the IDS and stamped postcard is enclosed herein. However, the Examiner did not consider the copy of the Notice of Office Action issued by the Korean Patent Office. The Examiner presently says that this IDS fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97 (c). However, the IDS does not fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(c) because it was filed on February 11, 2005, seven months before the mailing of the first Office Action on the merits. The first Office Action issued on September 20, 2005. Thus, a submission of an English language statement under 37 CFR 1.97(e) is not necessary.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6-19, 22-39, 42-48, 51-56, 59-69, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Santo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,284 – hereinafter Santo) in view of Kasuga et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,844,881 – hereinafter Kasuga).

The Office Action acknowledged that Santo does not teach or suggest a neutral zone between the first and third magnet parts and the position of the neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts along the focusing direction. Santo discusses that a problem exists because of the influence of movements associated with **ineffective portions** of the tracking coils 116 to 119, which do not contribute to the generation of the driving force in the tracking direction T_k , and thus, a tilt occurs in the moving member 106 (col. 3, lines 27-30). In Figs. 14A and 14B, Santo shows the ineffective portions 116c, 117c, 118c, 119c, 116d, 117d, 118d, and 119d as indicated by oblique hatching. In col. 4, lines 50-53, Santo teaches away from the use of ineffective portions because:

There is a problem that this radial tilt causes an aberration in the light beam spot focused on the recording face of the disc, adversely affecting the correct [recording] and reproduction of signals.

Thus, Santo teaches away from the use of, for example, "...a position of a neutral zone

between the first and third magnet parts, a position of a neutral zone between the second and fourth magnet parts" as recited in independent claims 1, 17, and 35.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Kasuga makes up for the deficiencies of Santo. The teachings of Kasuga would not apply to Santo because Santo teaches away from a neutral zone.

Therefore, Kasuga cannot be relied upon to cure the deficiencies of Santo.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____

9/18/06

By: _____

Lisa A. Kilday
Registration No. 56,210

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501